

Deliberative Process in Sharing Information with Different Audiences: Eye-tracking Correlates

Journal:	<i>Quarterly Journal of Experimental Psychology</i>
Manuscript ID	QJE-STD-21-024.R2
Manuscript Type:	Standard Article
Date Submitted by the Author:	13-Jul-2021
Complete List of Authors:	Martin-Luengo, Beatriz; National Research University-Higher School of Economics, Center for Cognition and Decision Making Myachykov, Andriy; Northumbria University, Department of Psychology Shtyrov, Yury; Aarhus University
Keywords:	Conversational pragmatics, memory reporting, eye-tracking, confidence, social contexts

SCHOLARONE™
Manuscripts

Deliberative Process in Sharing Information with Different Audiences: Eye-tracking
Correlates

Beatriz Martín-Luengo¹, Andriy Myachykov^{1,2}, & Yury Shtyrov^{1,3}

¹ Beatriz Martín-Luengo (corresponding author), Centre for Cognition and Decision
Making, Institute for Cognitive Neuroscience, HSE University, Moscow, Russian
Federation

² Department of Psychology, Northumbria University, Newcastle-upon-Tyne, UK

³ Center of Functionally Integrative Neuroscience (CFIN), Department of Clinical
Medicine, Aarhus University, Aarhus, Denmark

Author's note

Corresponding author: Dr Beatriz Martín-Luengo, Krivokolenniy sidewalk 3, entrance
2, 101000, Moscow, Russian Federation. Email: bmartinluengo@hse.ru

ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-3642-5337>

Dr Andriy Myachykov: e-mail: andriy.myachykov@northumbria.ac.uk .

ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-1489-8582>

Prof Yury Shtyrov: email: yury.shtyrov@cfin.au.dk.

ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-7203-4902>

The authors have no conflicts of interest to disclose.

Abstract

Research on conversational pragmatics demonstrates how interlocutors tailor the information they share depending on the audience. Previous research showed that, in informal contexts, speakers often provide several alternative answers, whereas in formal contexts they tend to give only a single answer; however, the psychological underpinnings of these effects remain obscure. To investigate this answer-selection process, we measured participants' eye movements in different experimentally modeled social contexts. Participants answered general-knowledge questions by providing responses with either single (one) or plural (three) alternatives. Then, a formal (job interview) or informal (conversation with friends) context was presented and participants decided either to report or withdraw their responses after considering the given social context. Growth curve analysis on the eye movements indicates that the selected response option attracted more eye movements. There was a discrepancy between the answer selection likelihood and the proportion of fixations to the corresponding option – but only in the formal context. These findings support a more elaborate decision-making processes in formal contexts. They also suggest that eye movements do not necessarily accompany the options considered in the decision-making processes.

Keywords: Conversational pragmatics, memory reporting, eye-tracking, confidence, social contexts

Deliberative Process in Sharing Information with Different Audiences: Eye-tracking Correlates

Humans are social animals who, among other things, use interpersonal communication to establish and signal their relationships. As a result, it is important to investigate the processes associated with the communicational exchanges in order to gain a better understanding of how human relationships are shaped. These processes include the decisions we make about the information we want to share with others, and these decisions strongly depend on who our interlocutors may be (Ackerman & Goldsmith, 2008; Martín-Luengo, et al., 2021; Martín-Luengo, et al., 2018). Recent advances in technology allow us to obtain unbiased measures helping us understand the cognitive processes underlying these behaviours. One of the methods that has been very useful in this regard is eye-tracking. The current paper presents a study, in which we analysed eye movements accompanying the decision-making process that involved information exchanges during a conversation.

Conversational pragmatics

Most of the research on conversational pragmatics focuses on the processes related to the listener's ability to understand the message intended by the speaker (Noveck & Reboul, 2008). The opposite aspect of this interaction – *why* the speaker provides particular information and in *what amount* and manner – has received much less attention in existing research (Gibbs & Bryant, 2008; McCallum et al., 2016; Martín-Luengo et al., 2018; Der Henst et al., 2002; Vandierendonck & Van Damme, 1988). Overall, these and other studies support the validity of relevance theory in conversational pragmatics by showing that speakers provide the information they believe is important for the receiver (Wilson & Sperber, 1981; 2004) and suggesting that what the speaker shares depends on the social context in which the information

1
2
3
4 exchange takes place. For example, the speaker will round up or down their rendition of
5
6 current time if they believe that the exact time is not relevant in the conversation's
7
8 context (Der Henst et al., 2002). When, however, the speaker is aware that the precise
9
10 time is relevant, they tend to provide a more accurate time reading.
11
12

13
14 Requests to provide elaborate information, e.g., when answering difficult
15
16 questions, increase the complexity of the task and the corresponding results. In recent
17
18 research (Martín-Luengo et al., 2018), participants were asked difficult general
19
20 knowledge questions, for which they had to provide either a single answer or plural
21
22 (several) potential answers. Once they responded, they had to indicate whether they
23
24 would prefer to submit or withdraw their answer(s) (the so-called report option) in
25
26 either a formal or an informal context. The results indicated that in informal contexts,
27
28 e.g., when talking with friends, participants' responses were not affected by their
29
30 estimation of the accuracy of the information they were willing to provide, implying
31
32 that they used relatively lenient criteria to report. Particularly, in this informal context
33
34 the most reported option was the plural one, i.e., the one with several potential options
35
36 (only one of which could be correct). This pattern can be explained as an attempt to
37
38 offer a wider set of alternative answers to their friends by reporting all possible options
39
40 which potentially might lead to figuring out the correct answer. In formal contexts, e.g.,
41
42 in a job interview, participants tended to equally report and withhold both types of
43
44 answers, presumably in an attempt to keep the accuracy as high as possible.
45
46 Furthermore, in formal contexts participants preferred to report the option with fewer
47
48 alternatives when they had a reasonable level of confidence in the answer's accuracy. In
49
50 essence, participants tried to maintain a certain level of accuracy by withholding
51
52 questionable answers in a formal context whereas they provided more or less
53
54 unrestricted information in an informal context. We can assume that this restricted
55
56 behaviour in the formal context reflects participants' attempt to present themselves as
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4 more knowledgeable and consequently increase their chances of success (e.g., being
5
6 employed). In the informal context, however, participants' lenient reporting was aimed
7
8 to provide their friends with any information that could lead to finding the correct
9
10 answer, even by association.
11
12

13
14 In the present research, we aimed to improve our understanding of the
15
16 information exchange processes involved in conversational pragmatics by measuring
17
18 interlocutors' eye gaze behaviour. In particular, we were interested in studying which
19
20 were the options that participants considered for each social context, and, which other
21
22 were automatically discarded once the context was revealed. A major advantage of
23
24 studying eye movements with regard to decision making tasks is that it provides
25
26 relatively unbiased information in relation to the associated written or spoken reports.
27
28 *Response bias* occurs when participants align their answers due to social conventions or
29
30 because they try to guess the experiment's aims and hypotheses and modify their
31
32 answers accordingly (Furnham, 1986). Therefore, using eye movements allows
33
34 researchers to avoid this bias by obtaining more objective measures.
35
36
37
38

39
40 Furthermore, the recording of eye movements is considered a reliable and
41
42 chronometrically accurate approximation of the internal processes involved in
43
44 conversational decision making (Holmqvist, et al., 2011). Supporting this view,
45
46 Shimojo, et al. (2003) showed that, in a like-dislike task involving a choice between two
47
48 images, the stimuli selected for reporting attracted more gazes than the ignored ones.
49
50 These authors also found that, following an initial stage when gazes were roughly
51
52 evenly distributed between the two stimuli, the eventually chosen stimulus received
53
54 progressively more and longer gazes towards the final selection point – a phenomenon
55
56 dubbed a “gaze-cascade effect”.
57
58
59
60

Decision making and eye-tracking

Most of eye-tracking studies of decision making have a strong visual component in terms of the type of stimuli used (e.g., Bond, et al., 2014, used diagnostic visual decision making with radiographies; McLaughlin et al. 2018, used diagnostic visual decision making with electrocardiograms; Simion & Shimojo, 2006, 2007, used different kind of pictures such as people, places, etc). These bottom-up attentional studies rely in the visual saliency of the stimuli putting the stress on the ability of the participant to distinguish one object from another visually similar one; however, attention can be also goal-driven where the visual saliency is not as relevant as the stimulus meaning (Corbetta & Shulman, 2002; Theeuwes, 2010; Orquin & Loose, 2013). Although fewer, several studies in goal-driven decision making have been implemented with the use of eye-tracking techniques (Lindner, et al., 2014; Orquin & Loose, 2013). For example, in Lindner et al. (2014) two different groups of participants answered multiple choice questions, for which participants had high or low prior knowledge. The results showed that students with high prior knowledge spent more time looking at the correct answers options, and that the number of fixations on the selected target increased as a function of preference ratings both for high and low prior knowledge group of students. These results show that the underlying mechanism of making decisions, reflected in the eye movement patterns, does not depend on the participants' knowledge. This is particularly important for the present study because, following Lindner et al's findings; we used only difficult general knowledge questions as they offer a test bed that allows extrapolating to other question types of differing difficulty.

Another way to pursue these two research strands in decision-making with the use of eye-tracking measures is to address the core elements of this process: namely, personal preferences (e.g., attractive faces in Shimojo et al., 2003) or selection

1
2
3
4 appropriateness (e.g., correct answers during an exam in Lindner et al., 2014). In both
5
6 types of research, the number of fixations on the finally selected option was higher
7
8 compared to discarded alternatives, suggesting that the eye-tracking measures are
9
10 predictive of choice and preferences (i.e., gaze bias effect). Thus, it seems that the eye-
11
12 tracker may not be able to distinguish between personal and impersonal nature of the
13
14 decision-making processes since the outcome in both types of studies is similar. This,
15
16 however, may be seen as an advantage in studying decision making processes in
17
18 different social contexts. With regard to the two research strands discussed above, the
19
20 decision making process could be considered as biased towards a knowledge-related
21
22 decision in formal contexts, such as a job interview, with the ostensible goal of
23
24 maximizing the final outcome. In an informal context, such as talking with friends, the
25
26 decision making might have stronger grounding in personal preferences and not biased
27
28 towards the response veracity. Considering the wide variety of social contexts, the lack
29
30 of differences in eye-tracking data may allow for a direct comparison between decision
31
32 making strategies in different social contexts. This is important because decision
33
34 making may have a stronger ground in subjectively personal preferences in some social
35
36 contexts compared to others.

37
38
39
40
41
42
43 Despite the dominant trend of using strong visual stimuli to study decision
44
45 making via eye movements (Bond, et al., 2014; McLauchlin et al., 2017; Simion &
46
47 Shimojo, 2006, 2007), studies like Lindner's demonstrate that eye-tracking is also a
48
49 useful tool for investigating other decision-making processes based on the attentional
50
51 goal-driven processes. The current study builds on this approach.
52
53
54
55
56

57 **The present research**

58
59 For the purposes of further advances in this research filed with the help of eye-
60 tracking techniques, we designed an experimental protocol using general knowledge

1
2
3
4 questions that have been instrumental in previous, purely behavioral, research in this
5
6 area. We limited our material set to include only difficult questions because such
7
8 questions ensure that participants become engaged in a deeper decision-making process.
9
10 These types of questions also allow measuring the strategic regulation of accuracy
11
12 (Ackerman & Goldsmith, 2008). If the questions were easy, participants would mainly
13
14 report them in their single version regardless of the context. Moreover, we combined
15
16 two different answer modes allowing us to generalize towards the two different types of
17
18 answers (see below) typically occurring during a conversation. Finally, we manipulated
19
20 social context across the two different types – formal and informal – in order to analyze
21
22 the resulting variability of the communicational exchanges.
23
24
25

26
27 In relation to the type of answer requested, we implemented in one step (see
28
29 Figure 1) the combination of the *plurality option* (Luna, et al., 2011) along with the
30
31 *report option* (Koriat & Goldsmith, 1994), and only the eye-tracking measures during
32
33 the selection of these combined answers were the object of our analysis. Both plurality
34
35 and report options are procedures used to study the informativeness-accuracy trade-off
36
37 in memory reporting (Luna & Martín-Luengo, 2017; Martín-Luengo et al., 2018;
38
39 Martín-Luengo et al., 2021). In case of the plurality option, participants are first
40
41 requested to select or provide one candidate answer (i.e., single answer) and then to add
42
43 more alternatives conforming to the plural answer. Finally, participants have to select
44
45 the type of answer, single or plural, that should be counted as their final selection. In the
46
47 report option the usual procedure entails the selection of one potential answer candidate
48
49 and then deciding whether this alternative will be finally reported or if the answer will
50
51 be left blank. In relation to the present experiment, if we had decided to use the plurality
52
53 option only, we would have missed an opportunity to examine the eye-tracking
54
55 correlates of decision making in the circumstances when participants may prefer to
56
57 leave the question unanswered. There are some situations in which, for example, people
58
59
60

1
2
3
4 may not want to be perceived as lacking knowledge or as being inaccurate, so they may
5
6
7 decide not to provide any answer despite having one or several potential candidates.

8
9 Similarly, we would not be able to examine the eye-tracking correlates of those
10
11 situations, in which participants' preferred an answer with more than one alternative.
12
13 Moreover, the resulting four answer possibilities via a combination of these two
14
15 procedures are closer to real-life contexts compared to those using any of the described
16
17 procedures alone. Therefore, we decided to combine them in order to offer participants
18
19 the widest possible (but still fully controlled in counterbalanced fashion) set of answer
20
21 alternatives: single report, single withhold, plural report, plural withhold. This is not the
22
23 first experiment where plurality and report options are used at in one experiment (Luna
24
25 & Martín-Luengo, 2017; Martín-Luengo et al., 2018), but this is the first time both tasks
26
27 are used in a single step. Despite this methodological alteration, we do not expect to
28
29 find any major difference in the distribution of the answers among the four options.
30
31
32
33

34 In relation to the social context, we adopted the definitions of informal and
35
36 formal contexts from Martín-Luengo et al. (2018; see Table 1). In order to allow
37
38 participants to simulate these social contexts, we characterized the informal context as a
39
40 “meeting with friends” where the context is relatively relaxed; for the formal context,
41
42 we used a “job interview” scenario with participants instructed that they have a good but
43
44 still unclear chance of getting a job, so there was a degree of tension and uncertainty
45
46 about the outcome. At the behavioral level, we expected to replicate previous findings
47
48 by Martín-Luengo et al. (2018) regardless of a slight difference in the methodology
49
50 used. Specifically, we expected an overall higher proportion of reported answers of any
51
52 kind (single or plural) in the informal than in the formal context. We also predicted a
53
54 similar proportion of single reported and plural withheld answers for the formal context.
55
56
57
58
59 With respect to eye movements, we expected to register an initial general exploration of
60
all options (Glaholt, & Reingold, 2011) in both scenarios, followed by an earlier

1
2
3
4 eventual preferential focus shift towards the selected alternatives in the formal context.
5
6 We hypothesised that this earlier shift in the formal context would reflect the necessity
7
8 to be focused on the context that might have more “serious” consequences. That is, we
9
10 expected that participants would demonstrate a degree of “alertness” related to the
11
12 formal context by an earlier progression from a general consideration of all possible
13
14 answers to the options that could maximize their success. Conversely, we expected that
15
16 the same progression will be delayed in the informal context due to its more “relaxed”
17
18 nature. Finally, based on the gaze-bias effect (Shimojo et al., 2003), we expected that
19
20 the options selected more frequently in each of the two scenarios would be the ones
21
22 with a higher fixation proportion, especially during the time nearer to making the final
23
24 selection.
25
26
27
28
29
30
31

32 Method

33 Participants and Design

34
35
36 Thirty-one volunteers (25 females, mean age = 23 years old, SD = 3.05)
37
38 participated in this experiment for a small monetary compensation (250 roubles, ~ 3.55
39
40 USD). The sample size was calculated based on Luna et al. (2011, Exp.1.), the first
41
42 study using the plurality-option and the effect size to investigate differences in accuracy
43
44 between single reported and withheld answers, the most relevant measure showing the
45
46 regulation of the accuracy in memory reporting when no social context is indicated. Our
47
48 power analysis with alpha-level set at .05 and power at .80 showed that a sample of 6
49
50 participants would suffice to reach a similar effect size of $d = 1.37$.
51
52
53

54 Materials

55
56
57 Forty general knowledge questions were adopted from Martín-Luengo et al.
58
59 (2018). Answer alternatives were not provided, and participants had to type the answers
60
for each question. According to the study protocol, participants first provided a *single*

1
2
3
4 answer and then they added two more alternatives for the same question, *plural* answer.

5
6 In order to establish formal and informal conversational contexts, two grayscale pictures
7
8 were used (see Figure 1 panel B). To provide the formal context (“job interview”), the
9
10 corresponding picture portrayed three people at an office desk – with neutral facial
11
12 expressions and dressed formally. A picture portraying three people talking and
13
14 laughing and dressed in informal clothes was used to support the informal context
15
16 (“talking with friends”) (see Appendix). The size of both pictures was 768×468 pixels.
17
18
19
20 The contexts were randomized in such a way that the same question could appear in the
21
22 formal context to one participant and with the informal context to another participant.
23
24

25 **Procedure**

26
27 Each participant completed their experimental session individually. See Figure
28
29 1, panel A for a graphical representation of an experimental trial. First, participants were
30
31 presented with one question, and they were requested to provide a single answer and to
32
33 rate their confidence in the answer’s correctness. Next, participants were requested to
34
35 add two more potential answers to the already provided one and to rate their confidence
36
37 in these new answers as well. Following this, a fixation cross appeared in the center of
38
39 the screen followed by the social context prime picture, which was presented centrally.
40
41 Participants previewed the picture for 3 seconds in order to familiarize themselves with
42
43 it. Finally, the four options – single report, single withheld, plural report, plural withheld
44
45 – appeared beside the context picture, presented pseudorandomly in the four corners of
46
47 the screen, and participants had to choose one of them.
48
49
50
51

52 **Apparatus**

53
54 The experiment was programmed in SR Research Experiment Builder v2 (SR
55
56 Research Ltd, Ottawa, Canada) and run on an EyeLink 1000 desk-mounted setup. The
57
58 stimuli were presented on a 24-inch monitor with a refresh rate of 144 Hz. We recorded
59
60 the dominant eye only – determined by using a thumb test: participant is requested to

1
2
3
4 superimpose their thumb on a distant object, focus on it, and close their eyes
5
6 individually. The dominant eye is the one which visual field less shifted. Participants
7
8 head's position was controlled using a chin rest.
9

10 **Eye-movement data preprocessing and analyses**

11
12
13 Our choice of the specific eye-tracking measures was determined by our primary
14
15 interest in the period prior to making the final choice of the response option. To this
16
17 end, we identified the interest period as 1800 ms preceding the timepoint when
18
19 participants made their final choice by a mouse click on the selected option. This period
20
21 was subdivided into 90-time bins of 20 ms length each. To analyse the time course of
22
23 the eye behaviour preceding the answer selection, we computed multilevel regression or
24
25 growth curve analysis (GCA) on the number of fixations on each of the four answer
26
27 alternatives prior to the selection. GCA allows repeated measure observations in
28
29 longitudinal data while avoiding statistical problems associated with multiple t-tests
30
31 comparing performance in each time bin over the curves. GCA belongs to the family of
32
33 multilevel techniques that use orthogonal polynomials to model the time course of
34
35 events across multiple stimuli. In our case, these stimuli were the four answer options
36
37 (see Figure 2 panel B). This type of analysis has been extensively used in psychological
38
39 research (McArdle & Nesselrode, 2003), including the analysis of eye-tracking data
40
41 with the objective to conduct a longitudinal repeated measures analysis (Mirman, 2014;
42
43 Mirman, et al., 2008)¹.
44
45
46
47
48
49

50
51 Fixed-effects condition was the type of answer (single reported, single rejected,
52
53 plural reported, plural rejected) on all time terms. Participants and participant-by-
54
55 condition random effects were used on all time terms. The single reported option was
56
57 treated as the reference (baseline) condition. Normal approximation (i.e., treating t-
58
59
60

¹For a detailed explanation of the growth curve models, applications to eye-tracking analysis and R syntax to conduct them, check the Github page of Daniel Mirman's lab <https://dmirman.github.io/>

1
2
3
4 value as z-values) was used for the individual parameters' statistical significance (p-
5 values). Linear, quadratic, and cubic terms were computed to assess the shape of the
6 curves.
7
8
9

10 11 12 13 **Results**

14 15 **Behavioral results summary (for full report, see Supplemental Materials)**

16
17 See Figure 2, panel A, for the graphical representation of the proportion of
18 selections of each of the four alternatives (single report, single withhold, plural report,
19 plural withhold) by social context. We computed t-test comparisons and not ANOVAs
20 in order to avoid a collinearity violation, because the options in the report and plurality
21 option procedures are linear transformations of each other (Luna & Martín-Luengo,
22 2017; Luna, et. al, 2015; Martín-Luengo et al., 2018; Martín-Luengo et al., 2021): If an
23 answer was selected as a single option, it could not be simultaneously selected as a
24 plural option; similarly, if marked as a report option, it could not be selected as a
25 withhold option.
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37

38 Full results with respective statistics are presented in Supplemental Materials
39 and summarised here. Overall, our results replicated those reported previously in
40 Martín-Luengo et al. (2018). Specifically, there were more reported answers in the
41 informal than in the formal context. In the formal context, there were more single
42 reported than single withheld answers, and similar numbers of plural withheld and
43 plural reported answers. In the informal context, reporting options, both in the single
44 and in the plural response conditions were selected more often than withholding ones.
45 Also in this context, the most frequent answer was plural report. These results support
46 the differential pattern of answers depending on the social context.
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57

58
59 In general, therefore, our behavioural results support the notion that, at the same
60 level of knowledge, respondents select their report strategies taking their audience into

1
2
3
4 consideration. In particular, these results support the idea that in a job interview we will
5
6 try to show ourselves as knowledgeable as possible by mainly selecting single report
7
8 answers, while in the informal context it is preferred to help to find out the answer by
9
10 selecting the plural report alternative.
11
12

13 **Eye movements**

14
15
16 Prior to the analyses of the eye fixations, we ran a 2 Social context (formal,
17
18 informal) X 2 Report option (report, withhold) X 2 Plurality option (single, plural) on
19
20 the averaged total fixation time (see Figure 3). No main effects or interactions reached
21
22 significant differences (for Social context, $F(1, 30) = 0.282, p = .603, \eta_p^2 = 0.018$;
23
24 Report option, $F(1, 30) = 0.917, p = .353, \eta_p^2 = 0.058$; Plurality option, $F(1, 30) = 2.954,$
25
26 $p = .106, \eta_p^2 = 0.165$; Social context*Report option, $F(1, 30) = 0.010, p = .920, \eta_p^2 =$
27
28 0.000 ; Social context*Report option, $F(1, 30) = 1.170, p = .297, \eta_p^2 = 0.072$; Plurality
29
30 option *Report option, $F(1, 30) = 1.345, p = .264, \eta_p^2 = 0.082$; Social context*Plurality
31
32 option*Report option, $F(1, 30) = 0.141, p = .713, \eta_p^2 = 0.009$). This lack of differences
33
34 in the total time spent on each of the possible alternatives likely indicates that fixations
35
36 were longer on those alternatives with fewer fixations and shorter for those alternatives
37
38 that attracted a larger number of fixations.
39
40
41
42

43 **Eye movements – Growth curve analyses**

44
45
46 Analyses were performed using the lme4 R package, version 3.4.0. The code and
47
48 the growth curve analysis output can be found at the Supplemental Materials. Figure 2,
49
50 panel B, shows that the overall time course for target fixations was captured by a third-
51
52 order (cubic) orthogonal polynomial term. We included linear, quadratic, and cubic
53
54 terms in order to cover three curve changes (see Figure 2 panel B) that our data reveal:
55
56 initial change from flatness, early increase for fixation, and change of direction to
57
58 plateau. The interpretation of the significances in relations to the terms was performed
59
60 as follows: the intercept (0th order) was a constant difference, the linear (1st order) term

1
2
3
4 related to a single change of focus, the angle of the curve; the quadratic (2nd order)
5
6 terms relates to two changes from the focus, the central inflexion of the curve; and the
7
8 cubic (3rd order) term also indicated inflexions of the curve but at the extremities
9
10
11 (Kalénine, et al., 2012; Mirman, et al., 2008).
12

13 **Informal context.** There was a significant main effect on the intercept for single
14
15 withheld (Estimate = -0.0367, $SE = 0.0080$, $p < .001$) and plural withheld answers
16
17 (Estimate = -0.0227, $SE = 0.0080$, $p = .004$), but only marginally significant effect for
18
19 plural reported (Estimate = -0.0153, $SE = 0.0080$, $p = .056$). That is, single report
20
21 plural answers received a proportion of fixations similar to that for the plural report option, but
22
23 more fixations than the single and plural withheld options.
24
25
26

27 There were also differences in the linear term between single reported and plural
28
29 withheld answers (Estimate = -0.1137, $SE = 0.0565$, $p = .042$) as well as both linear and
30
31 cubic differences between single reported and withheld answers (for linear, Estimate = -
32
33 0.278, $SE = 0.056$, $p < .001$; for cubic, Estimate = 0.091, $SE = 0.0257$, $p < .001$). This
34
35 result indicates that both single and plural withheld option fixation patterns were
36
37 different from the single reported option in the inflections, that is, with one change in
38
39 directionality. In the case of the single withheld answers, this also occurred at an earlier
40
41 time. This pattern may be interpreted as if these two options were quickly disregarded in
42
43 the consideration as options in favour of the subsequently reported ones.
44
45
46

47 **Formal context.** There was a significant main effect on the intercept for single
48
49 withheld (Estimate = -0.041, $SE = 0.008$, $p < .001$) and plural reported answers
50
51 (Estimate = -0.037, $SE = 0.008$, $p < .001$), but not for plural withheld ones (Estimate = -
52
53 0.013, $SE = 0.008$, $p = .127$). These differences indicate that, overall, there was a higher
54
55 percentage of fixations towards single reported answers than towards single withheld or
56
57 plural reported answers. These differences indicate that the two competing options were
58
59 single reported and plural withheld in this context.
60

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

There were also differences in the linear (Estimate = -0.274, $SE = 0.060$, $p < .001$) and the cubic (Estimate = 0.066, $SE = 0.023$, $p = .005$) terms for the single withheld answers, and in the linear (Estimate = -0.242, $SE = 0.060$, $p < .001$) and cubic term (Estimate = 0.056, $SE = 0.023$, $p = .018$) for the plural reported answers. As in the formal context, this early change in the directionality of the curves could be interpreted as an early disregard of these two options, though in some cases they were finally selected.

Discussion

Attention plays an active and important role in decision making (Orquin & Loose, 2003). Most of the research on decision making with the use of eye-tracking has been focused on the top-down attention component (Bond, et al, 2014; McLaughlin et al. 2018; Simion & Shimojo, 2006, 2007). However, eye-tracking has proven to be equally useful in goal-driven research in decision making (Lindner et al., 2014) as is also the case here. In particular, we used it here to further understand conversational pragmatics from the speaker's point of view. To that aim, participants answered general knowledge questions and later were requested to decide whether they would report or withhold a full or a short answer in different social contexts (formal or informal). At behavioural level our results replicated previous research (Martín-Luengo et al. 2018) and align well with the relevance theory which states that speakers tend to provide the information they believe is important for the receiver (Wilson & Sperber, 1981; 2004). The use of eye-tracking allowed us to assess whether the most selected options in formal and informal contexts at the behavioral level were the options with more gaze fixations, as suggested by earlier research that provides evidence in favor of the gaze bias effect (i.e., Shimojo et al., 2003; Lindner et al., 2014). Overall, this expectation was confirmed as we found that the most preferred options in each context were those with

1
2
3
4 more gaze fixations. However, the remaining options were not equal in terms of
5
6 attracting participants' attention. This is a novel result suggesting that the more fixated
7
8 options are not always the ones finally selected in conversational pragmatics decision
9
10 making tasks.
11
12

13 **Do the final selection options attract more attention prior to decision?**

14
15
16 **Informal context.** In this context both report options, single and plural were
17
18 most frequent, with the plural report option selected more often than the single report
19
20 option (Martín-Luengo et al., 2018). The withheld options were barely selected. Also in
21
22 this context, gaze fixation results parallel the pattern observed in the behavioral data.
23
24 This fact reflects that participants were willing to report any answer as there was little
25
26 stress or urgency to appear as experts on the topic. Considering these behavioral and
27
28 eye-tracking data together, it can be concluded that participants treated single and plural
29
30 report options as equally appealing, but, since the plural choice has more chances of
31
32 including the correct alternative, they preferentially selected that one. Even if no plural
33
34 option alternative is correct, this still allows narrowing down the search for a correct
35
36 answer. In short, in the informal context both behavioral and eye-fixations results
37
38 converge in the same conclusion: participants would try to offer most complete
39
40 information to their friends.
41
42
43
44

45
46 **Formal context.** As Figure 2A illustrates, the single report was selected more
47
48 often in the formal context, reflecting participants' tendency to opt for a more common
49
50 and acceptable answer in this context, in line with previous behavioral results (Martín-
51
52 Luengo et al., 2018). After the selection of a single report, participants equally selected
53
54 any of the plural options as a way to control the accuracy, since plural options are the
55
56 ones with more chances of being correct. However, if we consider the proportions of
57
58 fixations on each of the four answer alternatives, we may see a slightly different pattern.
59
60 We found no differences between single and plural withheld options in the proportion of

1
2
3
4 fixations in this formal context, and there were significantly more fixations for the
5
6 single reported than for single withheld and plural reported options. This pattern
7
8 supports the notion that the options that receive more attention prior to the final
9
10 decision-making point are the ones which are selected more often, but that there also seem
11
12 to be cases in which an option does not necessarily need to attract many fixations before
13
14 it is selected, as we found in the case of the plural report alternative. This divergence
15
16 between behavioral and eye-tracking data may result from the specific properties of the
17
18 formal context used, i.e., job interview. A job interview contextualizes a general aim of
19
20 a knowledge-based behavior with strife for answer veracity and a positive objective
21
22 outcome. However, this is also a social situation where subjective preferences and social
23
24 expectations are common, e.g., not leaving any questions unanswered. Thus, a more
25
26 complex situation, not solely based on the interviewee's knowledge or subjective
27
28 preferences may lead to a different oculomotor behavior pattern.
29
30
31
32
33

34 How can we explain that the plural reported answers were less fixated but still
35
36 equally selected along with the single report? Single reported answers are the natural
37
38 type of answer to any question, but they are also the preferred option in this particular
39
40 communicative context because they demonstrate certain knowledge (Ackerman &
41
42 Goldsmith, 2008; Martín-Luengo et al., 2018). Notably, the use of difficult questions in
43
44 this experiment makes the plural withheld option the safest choice: the accuracy remains
45
46 as high as possible, because there are more chances that the correct answer was included
47
48 among the different alternatives. However, while the single report option is acceptable
49
50 albeit riskier and the plural withhold option is safe but unacceptable (it would mean to
51
52 provide no answer), the option that would compromise between these alternatives is the
53
54 plural report: it includes all alternatives and thus has a higher chance of being correct, it
55
56 implies certain knowledge on the topic, and it does provide an answer. The participants
57
58 may have therefore mainly considered either single report or plural withheld, but
59
60

1
2
3
4 sometimes, possibly randomly and impulsively, participants tried to compensate the
5
6 accuracy by selecting the plural report answers.
7

8
9 The fact that one of the less fixated options was also the one more frequently
10 selected is contrary to what gaze “cascade-effect” framework suggests but it is well
11 aligned with other results in the literature (Orquin & Loose, 2013). In their review,
12 Orquin and Loose showed that the process of decision-making and its eye-movement
13 correlates depend on different factors including the cognitive processes involved that
14 will vary depending on the particular experimental task. Some experiments primarily
15 rely on the working memory processes; others – on the processes of attention (e.g., top-
16 down, bottom-up). Thus, one needs to consider the particular task and stimuli the
17 experiment used, and because of that, some of the results might not be aligned with the
18 previous literature findings. This is what seems to happen when we try to fit our results
19 in the formal context for the less selected alternatives. Further research would be
20 necessary to confirm these novel findings.
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35

36 Finally, it is also worth mentioning that, despite differences in the proportion of
37 fixations to the different answer types, the average fixation duration did not differ.
38 Duration difference have previously been linked to preferences – the longer the fixation,
39 the higher the preference for the stimulus (Glaholt, et al., 2009; Maughan, et al., 2007).
40 In the present study we did not register a similar pattern. This discrepancy might be due
41 to the nature of the stimuli, visual vs. semantic in our case, and it opens a new avenue
42 for the research regarding the divergences of gaze bias depending on the type of stimuli.
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51

52 **Implications**

53
54 This research contributes to the plethora of studies that employ eye-tracking
55 measurements to investigate decision-making process (Aryadoust, 2019; Emhardt et al.,
56 2020; Lindner et al., 2014). Here we have shown that it is also a very useful tool to
57 investigate in an unbiased fashion the underlying decision-making processes occurring
58
59
60

1
2
3
4 in communication exchanges. The use of self-reports about the decision can be biased
5
6 by the participants and blur the results. With the use of eye-tracking we remove any bias
7
8 from the results, and by its combination with behavioral measures we can have a closer
9
10 access to the nature of participant's behavior during a conversation.
11
12

13 In the particular case of this research we can reinforce the idea that people
14
15 develop a strategic use of their options in different social contexts (Ackerman &
16
17 Goldsmith, 2008; Martín-Luengo et al., 2018). In the formal context participants
18
19 employed a strategy aimed at conveying the most positive image of themselves to
20
21 potentials employers, and in the case of the informal context, talking with friends, they
22
23 tried to maximize the chances of giving the correct answer. Although more research is
24
25 needed in this regard, we can tentatively conclude that the decision-making process is
26
27 more complex in formal than in informal contexts. This information is crucial to
28
29 develop and complement theories about the pragmatics in conversations, particularly
30
31 considering the speaker's point of view. The pragmatics of the speaker's side of the
32
33 conversation has been less studied in the past and more research is needed in order to
34
35 have a complete picture about how and what variables affect social interactions.
36
37
38
39

40 41 **Limitations & future research**

42
43 Despite the obvious usefulness of eye-tracking technique for studies like the one
44
45 presented here, it also has its limitations. It is not an invasive technique and is entirely
46
47 safe, but using high-resolution eye-tracking with head fixed on a chin rest makes the
48
49 laboratory set-up more distant from that of a natural conversation. Future research on
50
51 this topic might consider using portable or wearable eye-trackers which could make the
52
53 experimental settings more ecological.
54
55

56
57 Another limitation of this study is the number of contexts used. We decided to
58
59 use only two contexts to avoid the reduction of variance and to maximize potential
60
differences between the two contexts, for a clearer result. This makes our conclusions

1
2
3
4 restricted to these two particular situations and not to all formal and informal contexts.

5
6 For example, testifying in a court is a formal context in which in most of the countries it
7
8 is compulsory to declare any type of information related to the matter judged. In that
9
10 particular case, a decision to withhold an answer to avoid being incorrect or to try to
11
12 show ourselves as knowledgeable is not an option.
13
14

15
16 Finally, for the type of general knowledge questions we used, it is not possible to
17
18 investigate whether participants would vary their lexicon depending on the social
19
20 context. For example, in a question like “What is the name of the insect that glows at
21
22 night?” participants could decide to answer “lightning bug” when questioned by friends
23
24 or in an informal context, whereas it is more likely that they would decide to
25
26 answer “firefly” in a formal context. This is a very interesting venue for future research
27
28 where eye-tracking measures may potentially offer very valuable information.
29
30
31

32
33 In sum, several things will need to be considered in follow-up studies in order to
34
35 overcome these limitations. That notwithstanding, the current experiment is the first one
36
37 to study conversational pragmatics from the speaker point of view with the use of eye-
38
39 tracking, which opens an exciting avenue for further research in the future.
40
41
42
43
44

45 **Compliance with Ethical Standards**

46
47 Funding: This article is an output of a research project implemented as part of
48
49 the Basic Research Program at the National Research University Higher School of
50
51 Economics (HSE University). This study used the HSE Synchronous Eye-tracking,
52
53 Brain Signal Recording and Non-Invasive Brain Stimulation System.
54
55

56
57 Data accessibility: materials and data are available upon request from the first
58
59 author.
60

Conflict of interest: none of the authors have conflict of interest.

1
2
3
4 Ethical approval: All procedures performed in studies involving human
5
6 participants were in accordance with the ethical standards of the institutional and/or
7
8 national research committee and with the 1964 Helsinki declaration and its later
9
10 amendments or comparable ethical standards. This work received the approval of the
11
12 HSE ethics committee.
13
14
15
16
17

18 **Supplementary Material**

19
20 The Supplementary Material is available at: qjep.sagepub.com
21
22
23
24

25 **Acknowledgements**

26
27 The authors thank Dr Nikolay Novitskiy Dr Olga Martynova, Dr Zach Yapple, Dr
28
29 Tizziana Pedale, and Dr Maria Nazarova for their help in creating the stimulus for this
30
31 experiment.
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

References

- Ackerman, R., & Goldsmith, M. (2008). Control over grain size in memory reporting – With and without satisficing knowledge. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Learning, Memory, and Cognition*, *34*, 1224–1245.
<https://doi.org/10.1037/a0012938>
- Aryadoust, V. (2019). Dynamics of item reading and answer changing in two hearings in a computerized while-listening performance test: an eye-tracking study. *Computer Assisted Language Learning*, *1*, 28.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/09588221.2019.1574267>
- Bond, R. R., Zhu, T., Finlay, D. D., Drew, B., Kligfield, P. D., Guldenring, D., ... & Clifford, G. D. (2014). Assessing computerized eye tracking technology for gaining insight into expert interpretation of the 12-lead electrocardiogram: an objective quantitative approach. *Journal of Electrocardiology*, *47*, 895-906. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jelectrocard.2014.07.011>
- Corbetta, M., & Shulman, G. L. (2002). Control of goal-directed and stimulus-driven attention in the brain. *Nature Reviews Neuroscience*, *3*, 201-215.
<https://doi.org/10.1038/nrn755>
- Der Henst, V, Carles, L, & Sperber, D. (2002). Truthfulness and Relevance in Telling The Time. *Mind and Language*, *17(5)*, 457–466.
<https://doi.org/10.1111/mila.2002.17.issue-5>
- Emhardt, S., van Wermeskerken, M., Scheiter, K., & van Gog, T. (2020). Inferring task performance and confidence from displays of eye movements. *Applied Cognitive Psychology*, *34*, 1430–1443. <https://doi.org/10.1002/acp.3721>
- Gibbs Jr, R. W., & Bryant, G. A. (2008). Striving for optimal relevance when answering questions. *Cognition*, *106(1)*, 345-369.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cognition.2007.02.008>

- 1
2
3
4 Glaholt, M. G., & Reingold, E. M. (2011). Eye movement monitoring as a process
5
6 tracing methodology in decision making research. *Journal of Neuroscience,*
7
8 *Psychology, and Economics, 4*, 125–146. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0020692>
9
10
11 Glaholt, M. G., Wu, M. C., & Reingold, E. M. (2009). Predicting preference from
12
13 fixations. *PsychNology J.*, 7(2), 141-158.
14
15
16 Holmqvist, K., Nyström, M., Andersson, R., Dewhurst, R., Jarodzka, H., & van de
17
18 Weijer, J. (2011). *Eye tracking: A comprehensive guide to methods and*
19
20 *measures*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
21
22
23 Kalénine, S., Mirman, D., Middleton, E. L., & Buxbaum, L. J. (2012). Temporal
24
25 dynamics of activation of thematic and functional knowledge during
26
27 conceptual processing of manipulable artifacts. *Journal of Experimental*
28
29 *Psychology: Learning, Memory, and Cognition, 38*(5), 1274.
30
31
32 <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0027626>
33
34
35 Koriat, A., & Goldsmith, M. (1994). Memory in naturalistic and laboratory contexts:
36
37 Distinguishing the accuracy-oriented and quantity-oriented approaches to
38
39 memory assessment. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: General, 123*,
40
41 297–315. <https://doi.org/10.1037//0096-3445.123.3.297>.
42
43
44 Lindner, M. A., Eitel, A., Thoma, G. B., Dalehefte, I. M., Ihme, J. M., & Köller, O.
45
46 (2014). Tracking the decision-making process in multiple-choice
47
48 assessment: Evidence from eye movements. *Applied Cognitive*
49
50 *Psychology, 28*, 738-752. <https://doi.org/10.1002/acp.3060>
51
52
53 Luna, K., & Martín-Luengo, B. (2017). Using the regulation of accuracy to study
54
55 performance when the correct answer is not known. *Scandinavian Journal*
56
57 *of Psychology, 58*, 275-283. <https://doi.org/10.1111/sjop.12369>
58
59
60

- 1
2
3
4 Luna, K., Higham, P.A., & Martín-Luengo, B. (2011). Regulation of memory accuracy
5 with multiple answers: The plurality option. *Journal of Experimental*
6 *Psychology: Applied*, 17, 148–158. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0023276>
7
8
9
10
11 Luna, K., Martín-Luengo, B., & Brewer, N. (2015). Are regulatory strategies necessary
12 in the regulation of accuracy? The effect of direct-access answers. *Memory*
13 *& Cognition*, 43, 1180-1192. <https://doi.org/10.3758/s13421-015-0534-2>
14
15
16
17
18 Martín-Luengo, B., Luna, K., & Shtyrov, Y. (2021). Conversational pragmatics:
19 Memory reporting strategies in different social contexts. Manuscript
20 submitted for publication
21
22
23
24
25 Martín-Luengo, B., Shtyrov, Y., Luna, K., & Myachykov, A. (2018). Different answers
26 to different audiences: Effects of social context on the accuracy-
27 informativeness trade-off. *Memory*, 26, 993-1007.
28
29
30
31 <https://doi.org/10.1080/09658211.2017.1420196>
32
33
34 Maughan, L., Gutnikov, S., & Stevens, R. (2007). Like more, look more. Look more,
35 like more: The evidence from eye-tracking. *Journal of Brand*
36 *management*, 14(4), 335-342. <https://doi.org/10.1057/palgrave.bm.2550074>
37
38
39
40
41 McArdle, J. J., & Nesselroade, J. R. (2003). Growth curve analysis in contemporary
42 psychological research. *Handbook of Psychology*, 447-480. John Wiley &
43 Sons, Inc. <https://doi.org/10.1002/0471264385.wei0218>
44
45
46
47
48 McCallum, N. A., Brewer, N., & Weber, N. (2016). Memorial monitoring and control:
49 How confidence and social and financial consequences affect eyewitnesses'
50 reporting of fine-grain information. *Applied Cognitive Psychology*, 30, 375–
51 386. <https://doi.org/10.1002/acp.3212>
52
53
54
55
56
57 McLauchlin, L., Woznitza, N., Cairns, A., McFadden, S., Bond, R., Hughes, C., ... &
58 McConnell, J. (2017). Digital training platform for interpreting radiographic
59
60

1
2
3
4 images of the chest. *Radiography*, 24, 159-164.

5
6 <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.radi.2017.12.010>

7
8
9 Mirman, D. (2014). *Growth curve analysis and visualization using R*. CRC press.

10
11 Mirman, D., Dixon, J. A., & Magnuson, J. S. (2008). Statistical and computational

12
13 models of the visual world paradigm: Growth curves and individual

14
15 differences. *Journal of Memory and Language*, 59(4), 475-494.

16
17 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jml.2007.11.006>

18
19
20 Müller, J. A., Wendt, D., Kollmeier, B., & Brand, T. (2016). Comparing eye tracking

21
22 with electrooculography for measuring individual sentence comprehension

23
24 duration. *PLOS one*, 11, e0164627.

25
26 <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0164627>. eCollection 2016.

27
28
29 Noveck, I. A., & Reboul, A. (2008). Experimental pragmatics: A Gricean turn in the

30
31 study of language. *Trends in Cognitive Sciences*, 12(11), 425-431.

32
33 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tics.2008.07.009>

34
35
36 Orquin, J. L., & Loose, S. M. (2013). Attention and choice: A review on eye

37
38 movements in decision making. *Acta Psychologica*, 144, 190-206.

39
40 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.actpsy.2013.06.003>.

41
42
43 R Core Team (2018). *R: A language and environment for statistical computing*. R

44
45 *Foundation for Statistical Computing*, Vienna, Austria. URL

46
47 <https://www.R-project.org/>.

48
49
50 Shimojo, S., Simion, C., Shimojo, E., & Scheier, C. (2003). Gaze bias both reflects and

51
52 influences preference. *Nature Neuroscience*, 6, 1317-1322.

53
54 <https://doi.org/10.1038/nn1150>

55
56
57 Simion, C., & Shimojo, S. (2006). Early interactions between orienting, visual sampling

58
59 and decision making in facial preference. *Vision Research*, 46(20), 3331-

60
3335. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.visres.2006.04.019>

- 1
2
3
4 Simion, C., & Shimojo, S. (2007). Interrupting the cascade: Orienting contributes to
5
6 decision making even in the absence of visual stimulation. *Perception &*
7
8 *Psychophysics*, 69(4), 591-595. <https://doi.org/10.3758/BF03193916>
9
10
11 Theeuwes, J. (2010). Top-down and bottom-up control of visual selection. *Acta*
12
13 *Psychologica*, 135, 77-99. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.actpsy.2010.02.006>
14
15
16 Vandierendonck, A., & Van Damme, R. (1988). Schema anticipation in recall: Memory
17
18 process or report strategy? *Psychological Research*, 50, 116–122.
19
20 <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF00309211>
21
22
23 Wilson, D., & Sperber, D. (1981). On Grice's theory of conversation. In P. Werth (Ed.),
24
25 *Conversation and Discourse* (pp. 155–178). London: Croom Helm.
26
27 Reprinted in Kasher (ed.) 1998, vol. 1V, pp. 347–368.
28
29
30 Wilson, D., & Sperber, D. (2004). Relevance theory. In L. R. Horn & G. Ward (Eds.),
31
32 *The Handbook of Pragmatics* (pp. 607–632). Oxford: Blackwell
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Figure Captions


Figure 1A and 1B. Panel 1A: experimental procedure used on each trial. Analysis of eye-tracking correlates are based only on the step 5 data: combined plurality-report options decision. Panel 1B: the two pictures used to illustrate the two social contexts.

Figure 2. Panel 2A: Proportion of selected answer by context and answer type. The bars in the columns indicate the standard errors. **Panel 2B:** growth curves on the proportion of fixations on each of the four alternatives of answers for each social context. The intercept is located on the right side. The x-axis shows the time from -1800 prior to the decision until 0 ms when the participants click the mouse to make their selection. In both panels the data corresponding to the formal context appears on the left and on the right for the informal context. The black solid line at the -1350 ms in the formal context panel indicates the particular time in which the gaze starts to be distributed among the options. Note that, in the informal context panel, this time point is delayed and closer to the -900 ms.

Figure 3. Averaged total fixations times and standard errors (in milliseconds) for each of the four answer alternatives for each social context.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1A



1B



Figure 1A and 1B. Panel 1A: experimental procedure used on each trial. Analysis of eye-tracking correlates are based only on the step 5 data: combined plurality-report options decision. Panel 1B: the two pictures used to illustrate the two social contexts.

147x178mm (120 x 120 DPI)




Figure 2. Panel 2A: Proportion of selected answer by context and answer type. The bars in the columns indicate the standard errors. Panel 2B: growth curves on the proportion of fixations on each of the four alternatives of answers for each social context. The intercept is located on the right side. The x-axis shows the time from -1800 prior to the decision until 0 ms when the participants click the mouse to make their selection. In both panels the data corresponding to the formal context appears on the left and on the right for the informal context. The black solid line at the -1350 ms in the formal context panel indicates the particular time in which the gaze starts to be distributed among the options. Note that, in the informal context panel, this time point is delayed and closer to the -900 ms.

281x218mm (120 x 120 DPI)

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60




Figure 2. Panel 2A: Proportion of selected answer by context and answer type. The bars in the columns indicate the standard errors. Panel 2B: growth curves on the proportion of fixations on each of the four alternatives of answers for each social context. The intercept is located on the right side. The x-axis shows the time from -1800 prior to the decision until 0 ms when the participants click the mouse to make their selection. In both panels the data corresponding to the formal context appears on the left and on the right for the informal context. The black solid line at the -1350 ms in the formal context panel indicates the particular time in which the gaze starts to be distributed among the options. Note that, in the informal context panel, this time point is delayed and closer to the -900 ms.

300x213mm (120 x 120 DPI)




Figure 3. Averaged total fixations times and standard errors (in milliseconds) for each of the four answer alternatives for each social context.

271x184mm (120 x 120 DPI)

Table 1. English translation of the Descriptions for Each Condition.

Formal context	Job Interview	Imagine that you are in an important job interview. You really need this job. You feel the tension, but you still try to look like an expert in the field.
Informal context	Conversation with friends	Imagine that you are with friends, having a good time. You feel relaxed and glad to be with them. You are having a cheerful conversation about different topics.